

Applicant: Phillip J. Roux et al
U.S.S.N.: 10/812,490
Filing Date: 3/30/2004
EMC Docket No.: EMC-04-010

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 19 2007

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action mailed August 23, 2006 the applicants respectfully request reconsideration. In the Office Action, claims 1-36 were rejected. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 18, 22, 25, 27, 30 and 36 have been amended and claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11-17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 31-33 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 4, 8-10, 18, 21, 22, 25-27, 30 and 34-36 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2-4, 7, 11-17, 19-21, 28-30, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as lacking proper antecedent basis for "the first power source" and "the second power source". Claims 2, 3, 7, 11-17, 19, 20, 28, 29, 32 and 33 have been canceled, claims 4, 21 and 30 do not contain the phrases "the first power source" and "the second power source", and claim 36 has been amended to change "source" to --supply--. Accordingly, this rejection has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-13, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26-28, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duncan et al., U.S. Pat No. 6,618,821. In view of the above amendments, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features recited in claim 3, which, other than the §112 rejection, was allowable. The language in claim 3 that was the subject of the §112 rejection has been amended.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is allowable over Duncan, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 8-10 depend from amended independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 11-17 have been canceled.

Applicant: Phillip J. Roux et al
U.S.S.N.: 10/812,490
Filing Date: 3/30/2004
EMC Docket No.: EMC-04-010

Claim 18 has been amended to include the features recited in claim 20, which, other than the §112 rejection, was allowable. The language in claim 20 that was the subject of the §112 rejection has been amended.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 18 is allowable over Duncan, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claim 21 depends from amended independent claim 18 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Claim 22 has been amended to include the features recited in claim 24, which was allowable.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 22 is allowable over Duncan, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 26 depend from amended independent claim 22 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22.

Claim 27 has been amended to include the features recited in claim 29, which, other than the §112 rejection, was allowable. The language in claim 29 that was the subject of the §112 rejection has been amended.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 27 is allowable over Duncan, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claims 30 and 34-36 depend from amended independent claim 27 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 27.

Claims 4, 21, 25 and 30 were amended to change their dependencies to the respective independent claims from which they depend.

Applicant: Phillip J. Roux et al
U.S.S.N.: 10/812,490
Filing Date: 3/30/2004
EMC Docket No.: EMC-04-010

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 19 2007

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-10, 15-17 and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan in view of Corcoran et al., (2004/0070908). In view of the above amendments, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Since claim 1 has been amended to be allowable and claims 8-10 depend from claim 1, claims 8-10 are also allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17 have been canceled.

Since claim 27 has been amended to be allowable and claims 34-36 depend from claim 27, claims 34-36 are also allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 4, 8-10, 18, 21, 22, 25-27, 30 and 34-36 are allowable over the art of record and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (508) 293-7835.

Please charge all fees occasioned by this submission to Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/19/07



Scott A. Ouellette, Esq. (Reg. No. 38,573)
Attorney for Applicant
EMC Corporation
Office of General Counsel
176 South Street
Hopkinton, MA 01748
Telephone: (508) 293-7835
Facsimile: (508) 293-7189